

### REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

In item 1 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner required a new title. Accordingly, the title has been amended to incorporate the Examiner's suggestion.

In item 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 20 were objected to because of a minor informality, specifically the language "wherein in." First, it is noted that claim 1 does not include such language. Claims 2-6 have been amended to remove the language objected to by the Examiner. Also, note that claim 20 has been rewritten as new claim 29 and new claim 29 does not include the language objected to by the Examiner.

In item 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, because of the language "the storage" and "the transmission medium" causing insufficient antecedent basis. Thus, claim 8 has been amended to properly recite "a storage medium" and "a transmission medium."

By this amendment, claims 1-9, 12, 13, and 16-19 have been amended to improve the U.S. form of the claims and to overcome the objections and indefiniteness rejections by the Examiner. Also, claims 10, 11, 14, 15, and 20-24 have been canceled in favor of new claims 25-33, respectively. The new claims 25-33 have been drafted in such a way as to improve the U.S. form of the claims.

In item 5 beginning on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-7, 9-19, 22, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Furukawa. In item 14 beginning on page 5 of the Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furukawa in view of Hogg.

In item 15 beginning on page 6 of the Office Action, claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furukawa in view of Cox.

In item 16 beginning on page 7 of the Office Action, claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furukawa in view of Schneier.

Each of the rejections listed above relies on the Furukawa reference either alone or as the primary reference. The Furukawa reference has a filing date of June 30, 1999. This filing date of Furukawa is later than the foreign priority date claimed in the present application, i.e., the filing date of September 2, 1998 of Japanese Patent Application No. 10-248708.

A translation of the foreign priority document is filed herewith along with a Declaration that the translation is accurate.

It is submitted that by reviewing at least claims 1-22 on pages 1-12 of the translation, it is clear that all the claims of the present application are supported by the foreign priority document.

By the filing of the translation of the foreign priority document, Applicants have perfected their claim of foreign priority to Japanese Patent Application 10-248708, filed September 2, 1998. As such, the Furukawa reference is removed as prior art. For this reason, it is submitted that claims 1-9, 12, 13, 16-19, and 25-33 are allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Toshiya TAKAHASHI

By: 

Jeffrey R. Filipek  
Registration No. 41,471  
Attorney for Applicant

JRF/fs  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
December 16, 2003